

## REMARKS

In the Final Office Action of October 30, 2007, claims 6, 7, 9-19 and 21-40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Number 6,459,442 B1 (hereinafter “Edwards et al.”). Furthermore, claims 8 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Edwards et al. in view of U.S. Patent Number 6,184,885 B1 (hereinafter “DeStefano”).

In response, Applicant has amended the independent claims 6, 18 and 30 to more clearly distinguish the claimed invention from the cited reference of Edwards et al. In addition, claims 9, 21 and 32 have been canceled, and claims 10-12, 22-24 and 33-35 have been amended. As amended, Applicant respectfully asserts that the independent claims 6, 18 and 30 are not obvious in view of the cited reference of Edwards et al., as explained below. In view of the claim amendments and the following remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the pending claims 6-8, 10-20, 22-31 and 33-40 be allowed.

### 1. Patentability of Amended Independent Claims 6, 18 and 20

As amended, the independent claim 1 recites in part “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element,*” which is not disclosed in Edwards et al. Consequently, the amended independent claim 6 is not obvious over Edwards et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 6 be allowed.

The cited reference of Edwards et al. discloses a system for applying application behaviors to freeform data. The system of Edwards et al. describes grouping freeform strokes into one or more segments on a display. The segments described in Edwards have been equated to the claimed “*display-and-control graphic element.*” However, Edwards et al. fails to teach a defined operational relationship between a graphic object in a “segment” and another graphic object outside of that “segment.” Thus, Edwards et al.

fails to teach the limitation of “*wherein said second graphic element outside of said display-and-control graphic element has a defined operational relationship with said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element*,” as recited in the amended independent claim 6. Consequently, the amended independent claim 6 is not obvious  
5 over Edwards et al. As such, Applicant respectfully requests that the independent claim 6 be allowed.

The above remarks are also applicable to the independent claims 18 and 30, which recite similar limitations as the amended independent claim 6. Thus, Applicant  
10 respectfully asserts that the amended independent claims 18 and 30 are also not obvious in view of the cited reference of Edwards et al., and requests that these amended independent claims 18 and 30 be allowed.

2. Patentability of Dependent Claims 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-29, 31 and 33-40

Each of the dependent claims 7, 8, 10-17, 19, 20, 22-29, 31 and 33-40 depends on one of the amended independent claims 6, 18 and 30. As such, these dependent claims include all the limitations of their respective base claims. Therefore, Applicant submits that these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as their respective  
20 base claims. Furthermore, these dependent claims may be allowable for additional reasons.

As an example, the dependent claim 10 recites “*wherein said first graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element and said second graphic element on  
25 said global drawing surface are configured such that said first graphic element is controlled by said second graphic element*,” which is not disclosed in Edwards et al. The Office Action on page 4 states that “Edwards teaches that the segment controller, regardless if it is the first or second graphic element, can control the output of a selected segment.” However, the segment controller described in Edwards is not a “graphic  
30 element” displayed in or outside a segment. Thus, Edwards et al. fails to teach the above limitation of the dependent claim 10.

The above remarks are also applicable to the dependent claim 11 since this claim recites a limitation similar to the dependent claim 10. As explained above, the “segment controller” described in Edwards et al. is not a “graphic element” displayed in or outside a segment. Thus, Edwards et al. fails to teach the limitation of “*wherein said first*  
5 *graphic element in said display-and-control graphic element and said second graphic element on said global drawing surface are configured such that said second graphic element is controlled by said first graphic element,*” as recited in the dependent claim 11.

10 Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the claims in view of the remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Denny Jaeger

15 Date: December 7, 2009

By: /thomas h. ham/

Thomas H. Ham

Registration No. 43,654

Telephone: (925) 249-1300